



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,744	01/25/2002	Kiyoshi Miyashita	111776	8620

7590

11/15/2006

Oliff & Berridge
PO Box 19928
Alexandria, VA 22320

EXAMINER

PESIN, BORIS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/031,744

Applicant(s)

MIYASHITA ET AL.

Examiner

Boris Pesin

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892).
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 8/22/2006.

Claims 1 and 3-27 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 23, 26, and 28 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 8/22/2006, Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, and 26 were amended and claims 2 and 28-29 were canceled. This action is made Non-Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, and 3-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification does not define ASP data, and it is not clear from the specification was exactly ASP data is.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa (JP 2002-023148) in view of Araujo et al. (US 6920502).

In regards to claim 1, Yasukawa teaches a projector capable of connection to a network, the projector comprising; a network connection portion for sending and receiving data over a network (Page 9, Paragraph [0013]); an internal image data generating portion for generating image data for display, based on data received via the network connection portion (Page 18, Paragraph [0045]); and a projection display portion for projecting the generated user interface image data (Page 11, Paragraph [0020]).

Yasukawa does not teach a network connection portion determining whether the received data is application service provider data and generating a user interface by executing an application program for the ASP data when then network connection portion determines that the received data is the ASP data. Araujo teaches, "Each remote client, running the ICA client program, would access, over, e.g., a WAN connection, a desired thin-client application hosted at the LAN-based server and establish a separate application session. The ICA client would communicate mouse clicks and keystrokes entered by a user stationed at the client PC, over the WAN connection, to the Metaframe program executing in the server which, in turn, would provide screen shots back to the client PC for local display to a user stationed thereat. This information would be carried between the client and server using an "ICA" protocol." (Column 4, Lines 7-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yasukawa's projector with the teachings of Araujo and include a thin client capabilities within the projector with the motivation to increase efficiency and productivity by providing remote access for individual users to all their office network-based functionality (Column 7, Lines 45-47).

In regards to claim 3, Yasukawa-Araujo teach a projector according to claim 1 the image data generating portion executing a viewer application and generating the user interface image data on the basis of the received data (Yasukawa Page 18, Paragraph [0045]).

In regards to claim 4, Yasukawa-Araujo teach a projector according to claim 1, the image data generating portion identifying the data format of the received data,

executing a suitable viewer application for the identified data format, and generating said user interface image data (Yasukawa Page 18, Paragraph [0045] and Pages 20 Paragraphs [0056-0058]).

In regards to claim 5, Yasukawa-Araujo teach a projector according to claim 1, further comprising: a playback audio data generating portion for generating audio data for playback on the basis of data received via the network connection portion; and an audio data playback portion for outputting the generated playback audio data (Yasukawa Page 18, Paragraph [0045] and Pages 20 Paragraphs [0056-0058]).

In regards to claim 6, Yasukawa-Araujo teach a projector according to claim 5, that data being multimedia data including motion video data and audio data associated with motion video data, the internal image data generating portion generating the user interface image data for display on the basis of motion video data received via the network connection portion, and the audio data playback portion generating playback audio data associated with the generated image data on the basis of audio data associated with motion video data received via the network connection portion (Yasukawa Page 18, Paragraph [0045] and Pages 20 Paragraphs [0056-0058]).

In regards to claim 7, Yasukawa-Araujo teach a projector according to claim 1 further comprising: an external input signal receiving portion for receiving an external input signal from an external input portion (Yasukawa Page 9, Paragraph [0013]).

In regards to claim 8, Yasukawa-Araujo teach the projector according to claim 7, further comprising: an identifier for uniquely identifying itself from other projectors, the external input portion including an identifier selecting portion for selecting the identifier,

and enabling unique input to one desired projector among a plurality of projectors (Yasukawa Page 9, Paragraph [0013], furthermore this feature is inherent in Yasukawa because if there is a connection between two devices there has to be some kind of identifier to differentiate devices).

In regards to claim 10, Yasukawa-Araujo teach the projector according to claim 7, further comprising: a data decision portion for deciding, during projection display and/or after projection display of the image data and via the external input portion, the next set of data to be received via the network (Yasukawa Page 11, Paragraph [0017]).

In regards to claim 11, Yasukawa-Araujo teach the projector according to claim 1, the projection display portion including an electro optical data output portion, a light source for illuminating the electro optical data output portion, and a lens for enlarging images projected by the light source (Yasukawa Page 17, Paragraph [0042]).

In regards to claim 12, Yasukawa-Araujo teach the projector according to claim 1, further comprising: and image data conversion portion for converting a projected image to image data; and a storage device for storing the converted image data (Yasukawa Page 9 Paragraph [0013], and Page 17 Paragraph [0042]).

In regards to claim 21, Yasukawa-Araujo teach the projector according to claim 14, the storage device being connected to the network, and the enhanced image data being stored in a storage device connected to the network (Yasukawa Page 9 Paragraph [0013], and Page 17 Paragraph [0042]).

In regards to claim 22, Yasukawa-Araujo teach the projector functioning as a terminal device for an application service provider (Yasukawa Page 18, Paragraph [0045] and Page 9 Paragraph [0013]).

In regards to claim 23, Yasukawa teaches a display system wherein results of operations performed by a server being displayed via a plurality of projectors connected over a network, the system comprising: a projector (Page 17, Paragraph [0042]); a data generating device, the data generating device being provided for each projector, to execute operations in response to a request from the projector to generate data for displaying user interface data (Page 18 Paragraph [0045] and Page 9 Paragraph [0013]); and a data transmitting device to transmit the generated data to the projector requesting the operations (Page 18 Paragraph [0045] and Page 9 Paragraph [0013]), the projector including: a transmitting/receiving device to transmit a request for the operations to the server via the network and to receive the data transmitted from the server (Page 18 Paragraph [0045] and Page 9 Paragraph [0013]); an internal image data generating device to generate image data for display on the basis of the received data (Page 18, Paragraph [0045] and Page 9 Paragraph [0013]); and projection display device to project the generated image data (Page 18, Paragraph [0045] and Page 9 Paragraph [0013]).

Yasukawa does not teach transmitting/receiving device determining whether the received data is ASP data, and generating ASP user interface image data by executing an application program for the ASP data when transmitting/receiving device determines that the received data is the ASP data. Araujo teaches, "Each remote client, running

the ICA client program, would access, over, e.g., a WAN connection, a desired thin-client application hosted at the LAN-based server and establish a separate application session. The ICA client would communicate mouse clicks and keystrokes entered by a user stationed at the client PC, over the WAN connection, to the Metaframe program executing in the server which, in turn, would provide screen shots back to the client PC for local display to a user stationed thereat. This information would be carried between the client and server using an "ICA" protocol." (Column 4, Lines 7-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yasukawa's projector with the teachings of Araujo and include a thin client capabilities within the projector with the motivation to increase efficiency and productivity by providing remote access for individual users to all their office network-based functionality (Column 7, Lines 45-47).

In regards to claim 24, Yasukawa-Araujo teach the display according to claim 23, the data generated by the generating device of the server having a unique format and consisting of differential data for previous data and current data, and the internal image data generating device of the projector using a client application to generate the user interface image data on the basis of the data (Yasukawa Page 9 Paragraph [0013], Page 18, Paragraph [0045] and Pages 20 Paragraphs [0056-0058]).

In regards to claim 25, Yasukawa-Araujo teach teaches a display system according to claim 23, the projector being a projector for an application server provider (Yasukawa Page 18, Paragraph [0045] and Page 9 Paragraph [0013]).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa-Araujo.

In regards to claim 9, Yasukawa-Araujo teaches the projector according to claim 7. Yasukawa-Araujo does not specifically teach an external input portion transmitting an input signal to the external input signal receiving portion by a wireless device. Official notice is given that it is well known in the art to transmit signals wirelessly. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yasukawa-Araujo and include a wireless transmitting device with the motivation to provide the user with more portability.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa-Araujo in view of Usami et al. (US 6785814).

In regards to claim 13, Yasukawa-Araujo teaches all the limitations of claim 12. Yasukawa-Araujo does not teach a date/time stamp portion for appending to the user interface image data, the conversion date/time or save date/time of the user interface image data. Usami teaches, "The image processing apparatus comprises image processing means 61 for carrying out image processing such as those described above on the original image data S0, supplementary information generating means 62 for generating process management information such as history of image processing, a degree of completeness, the time and date of processing, the deadline for the processing, and a relationship between jobs, as the supplementary information H, and

embedding means 63 for embedding the supplementary information H in the original image data S0 by using deep layer encryption as by the digital camera shown in FIG. 9." (Column 20, Line 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yasukawa-Araujo with the teachings of Usami and include the time/date stamp with the image data with the motivation to provide the user with more detailed information about a particular image.

In regards to claim 14, Yasukawa-Araujo and Usami teach all the limitations of claim 13. They further teach an enhancement portion for applying enhancements to a projected image, the image data conversion portion converting the enhanced image to enhanced image data, and the date/time stamp portion appending the date/time of the enhancement or the date/time the enhanced image data being saved (i.e. "The image processing apparatus comprises image processing means 61 for carrying out image processing such as those described above on the original image data S0, supplementary information generating means 62 for generating process management information such as history of image processing, a degree of completeness, the time and date of processing, the deadline for the processing, and a relationship between jobs, as the supplementary information H, and embedding means 63 for embedding the supplementary information H in the original image data S0 by using deep layer encryption as by the digital camera shown in FIG. 9." Usami, Column 20, Line 18).

Claims 15 -20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa-Araujo in view of Usami et al. (US 6785814) in view of Berstis (US 6615239).

In regards to claim 15, Yasukawa-Araujo and Usami teach all the limitations of claim 13. They do not teach an image data associating portion for associating a plurality of items of the user interface image data by way of associating data described in markup language. Berstis teaches, "the presentation text and any processed images are converted to a markup language format (e.g., HTML)." (Column 4, Line 50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yasukawa and Usami with the teachings of Berstis and include a method of associating data described in a markup language with the motivation to provide the user a more convenient format.

In regards to claim 16, Yasukawa-Araujo, Usami and Berstis teach all the limitations of claim 15. Yasukawa further teaches the image data associating portion chronologically associating a plurality of items of the user interface image data using either the conversion date/time or save date/time of the user interface image data (Page 9 Paragraph [0013], and Page 17 Paragraph [0042]).

In regards to claim 17, Yasukawa-Araujo, Usami and Berstis teach all the limitations of claim 15. Yasukawa further teaches the projection display portion reading and projecting the saved user interface image data (Page 9 Paragraph [0013], and Page 17 Paragraph [0042]).

In regards to claim 18, Yasukawa-Araujo and Usami teach all the limitations of claim 14. They do not teach an image data associating portion for associating a plurality of items of the user interface image data and the enhanced image data by way of association data described in markup language format. Berstis teaches, "the

presentation text and any processed images are converted to a markup language format (e.g., HTML)." (Column 4, Line 50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yasukawa-Araujo and Usami with the teachings of Berstis and include a method of associating data described in a markup language with the motivation to provide the user a more convenient format.

In regards to claim 19, Yasukawa-Araujo, Usami, and Berstis teach all the limitations of claim 18. Yasukawa further teaches, the image data associating portion chronologically associating a plurality of items of the enhanced image data and the image data, by using either the date/time of the enhancement or the save date/time of the enhanced image data in the case of the enhanced image data or by using the date/time of conversion or save date/time of the image data in the case of the image data other than the enhanced image data (Page 9 Paragraph [0013], and Page 17 Paragraph [0042]).

In regards to claim 20, Yasukawa-Araujo, Usami, and Berstis teach all the limitations of claim 15. Yasukawa further teaches a projection display portion reading and projecting the saved enhancement image data and/or image data (Page 9 Paragraph [0013], and Page 17 Paragraph [0042]).

Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylin et al. (US 6005534) in view of Yasukawa (JP 2002-023148) further in view of Araujo et al. (US 6920502).

In regards to claim 26, Hylin teaches a method for displaying images via a projector connected to a network, the method comprising; executing an application in response to a request from a client in a server connected to a network (i.e. "A number of working machines or working stations 32 are connected to the central computer 28 for controlling, communicating and processing of exposure or picture material, generating exposure lists through the exposure handler when required, and so on. Alternatively, the information mediators 24 may have their own versions of the exposure program used, thereby enabling the mediators to deliver finished picture sequences/films transparently. These picture sequences/films need not then be prepared in the control centre 12, but can be filed dynamically in the exposure list by the exposure handler." Column 11, Line 11); and transmitting to the requesting client and said projector via the network user interface data resulting from execution of the application in a server connected to the network (Figure 1, Element 14); receiving the transmitted user interface data in the projector (Figure 1, Element 38); generating image data for display on the basis of the received user interface data in the projector(Figure 1, Element 38); and projecting the generated image data (Figure 1, Element 22).

Hylin does not teach determining whether the received user interface data is ASP data, and generating, in the projector, image data by executing an application program for the ASP data when the received user interface data is the ASP data.

Yasukawa teaches a self-contained projector that is processes information internally (Page 18, Paragraph [0045]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hylin with the teachings of Yasukawa to include a self-contained projector with the motivation to provide for less equipment overhead.

Araujo teaches, "Each remote client, running the ICA client program, would access, over, e.g., a WAN connection, a desired thin-client application hosted at the LAN-based server and establish a separate application session. The ICA client would communicate mouse clicks and keystrokes entered by a user stationed at the client PC, over the WAN connection, to the Metaframe program executing in the server which, in turn, would provide screen shots back to the client PC for local display to a user stationed thereat. This information would be carried between the client and server using an "ICA" protocol." (Column 4, Lines 7-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hylin-Yasukawa's projector with the teachings of Araujo and include a thin client capabilities within the projector with the motivation to increase efficiency and productivity by providing remote access for individual users to all their office network-based functionality (Column 7, Lines 45-47).

In regards to claim 27, Hylin-Yasukawa-Araujo teach a method according to claim 26 the client being a second projector (Hylin Figure 1).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BP


KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100